

Message

From: Dunton, Cheryl [Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/8/2019 3:36:23 PM
To: Beck, Nancy [Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Media Inquiry on Susan Glassmeyer's research from freelancer; deadline tomorrow AM

Just sent something to Tala and Jeff to review.

From: Beck, Nancy
Sent: Friday, February 08, 2019 10:16 AM
To: Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>; Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>
Cc: Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>; Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>; Ortiz, Julia <Ortiz.Julia@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Media Inquiry on Susan Glassmeyer's research from freelancer; deadline tomorrow AM

Can we get a quick OPPT response to help with #4?

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
P: 202-564-1273
beck.nancy@epa.gov

Begin forwarded message:

From: "McDonough, Owen" <mcdonough.owen@epa.gov>
Date: February 8, 2019 at 10:07:49 AM EST
To: "Drinkard, Andrea" <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>, "Burneson, Eric" <Burneson.Eric@epa.gov>
Cc: "McClain, Jennifer" <McClain.Jennifer@epa.gov>, "Beck, Nancy" <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>, "Kramer, Jessica L." <kramer.jessical@epa.gov>
Subject: **RE: Media Inquiry on Susan Glassmeyer's research from freelancer; deadline tomorrow AM**

Edits to the ORD responses are below with new text in yellow and deleted text in red with strikeout.
Only #2 and #4 have any edits.

Adding Nancy and Jess here. Nancy, could you specifically review the response to question #4 as it pertains to the TSCA phase out of PFAS?

Thanks,
Owen

1. **Were you surprised to detect PFAS chemicals in 100% of the samples tested?**

Yes and no. In the first phase of the study, we sampled nine drinking water treatment plants for 84 pharmaceuticals and anthropogenic waste indicators (AWIs) but not PFAS. For this first phase, the maximum frequency of detection in the source water was 89 % for bupropion, and in the treated drinking water was 78 % for the disinfection byproduct

bromoform, and 66 % for caffeine. So the 100 % frequency for PFAS in the second phase is a marked difference. However, PFAS are known to be extremely persistent in the environment. Additionally, the method detection limit for the PFAS compounds was in some cases 2-3 orders of magnitude lower than the detection levels for pharmaceuticals and AWIs, so it isn't surprising that there were higher frequencies of detection. It may be the case that the pharmaceuticals could be just as widespread at the low, low concentrations we measured the PFAS at. We detected the PFAS because the method was able to quantitatively measure at the low environmental concentrations. If you lower the detection limits for any analyte, the frequency of detection will most likely increase.

2. The study detected PFAS in considerably more samples than previous estimates up to 2.38% in the UCMR3. What does this mean for the number of people who might be affected by PFAS contaminated water?

This is also related to the detection levels we used. The PFAS method we used in Phase II had detection levels less than 1 ng/L for all analytes; the method reporting limits used in the UCMR ranged from 10-90 ng/L. We had higher frequencies of detection since we could see lower levels in the water samples.

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

3. The study found 4 samples contained PFAS chemicals above the EPA recommended safety level for PFOS and PFOA. How concerning is this?

There were four samples, but these were the primary and duplicate of the source and treated drinking water from a single utility. We examined the UCMR data for the 25 drinking water treatment plants in the study, to see if the high level was persisting (UCMR 3 was collected after we collected the samples for this study). The UCMR only measures treated drinking water, so while the concentrations for this drinking water treatment plant were below the health advisory levels, we do not know if this is because the source water concentrations decreased, or if treatment changed and removal increased.

4) The study also found PFPeA and PFHpA at the highest concentrations. But typically we don't hear much about these two chemicals -- most of the attention is on what is thought to be the most common types - PFOS and PFOA. Why did the study find PFPeA and PFHpA at the highest concentrations and what does the finding about our ability to protect people from these substances in their drinking water?

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Drinkard, Andrea

Sent: Friday, February 8, 2019 8:42 AM

To: Burneson, Eric <Burneson.Eric@epa.gov>

Cc: McClain, Jennifer <McClain.Jennifer@epa.gov>; McDonough, Owen <mcdonough.owen@epa.gov>

Subject: Re: Media Inquiry on Susan Glassmeyer's research from freelancer; deadline tomorrow AM

I would suggest getting #4 reviewed by Nancy B as well since it talks about the phase out, but maybe David will take care of that with his edits.

I'd like to take a look after his edits are reflected since my review is mostly for messaging. Do you think that's doable?

On Feb 8, 2019, at 8:26 AM, Burneson, Eric <Burneson.Eric@epa.gov> wrote:

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: McClain, Jennifer

Sent: Friday, February 08, 2019 8:10 AM

To: McDonough, Owen <mcdonough.owen@epa.gov>

Cc: Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>; Burneson, Eric <Burneson.Eric@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Media Inquiry on Susan Glassmeyer's research from freelancer; deadline tomorrow AM

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: McDonough, Owen

Sent: Friday, February 08, 2019 7:26 AM

To: Dunlap, David <dunlap.david@epa.gov>

Cc: Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>; McClain, Jennifer <McClain.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Burneson, Eric <Burneson.Eric@epa.gov>

Subject: Re: Media Inquiry on Susan Glassmeyer's research from freelancer; deadline tomorrow AM

Will review this AM.

Andrea, Jennifer, and Eric can you take a quick look as well?

Thanks

Owen

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 8, 2019, at 6:55 AM, Dunlap, David <dunlap.david@epa.gov> wrote:

Owen,

I still need to review in detail but I want your awareness. My initial take is that this response will need some editing.

We can talk this morning. Deadline is irrelevant if this response is not factual, clear, concise and to the point.

DDD

David D. Dunlap
Deputy Assistant Administrator
EPA Office of Research & Development
Office 202.564.4941

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Maguire, Megan" <Maguire.Megan@epa.gov>

Date: February 7, 2019 at 4:59:29 PM EST

To: "Orme-Zavaleta, Jennifer" <Orme-Zavaleta.Jennifer@epa.gov>, "Dunlap, David" <dunlap.david@epa.gov>

Cc: "Christian, Megan" <Christian.Megan@epa.gov>, "D'Amico, Louis" <DAmico.Louis@epa.gov>, "Fitzpatrick, Kacey" <Fitzpatrick.Kacey@epa.gov>, "Fitzmorris, Amanda" <fitzmorris.amanda@epa.gov>, "Hubbard, Carolyn" <Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov>, "Mattas-Curry, Lahne" <Mattas-Curry.Lahne@epa.gov>

**Subject: Media Inquiry on Susan Glassmeyer's research
from freelancer; deadline tomorrow AM**

Hi- Natasha Gilbert, a freelance writer, sent some questions about NERL's Susan Glassmeyer's paper "Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances in source and treated drinking waters of the United States" that published in *Science of the Total Environment*. Susan drafted responses to the 4 questions. The deadline is tomorrow morning. Are you all good with these?

1. Were you surprised to detect PFAS chemicals in 100% of the samples tested?

Yes and no. In the first phase of the study, we sampled nine drinking water treatment plants for 84 pharmaceuticals and anthropogenic waste indicators (AWIs) but not PFAS. For this first phase, the maximum frequency of detection in the source water was 89 % for bupropion, and in the treated drinking water was 78 % for the disinfection byproduct bromoform, and 66 % for caffeine. So the 100 % frequency for PFAS in the second phase is a marked difference. However, PFAS are known to be extremely persistent in the environment. Additionally, the method detection limit for the PFAS compounds was in some cases 2-3 orders of magnitude lower than the detection levels for pharmaceuticals and AWIs, so it isn't surprising that there were higher frequencies of detection. It may be the case that the pharmaceuticals could be just as widespread at the low, low concentrations we measured the PFAS at. We detected the PFAS because the method was able to quantitatively measure at the low environmental concentrations. If you lower the detection limits for any analyte, the frequency of detection will most likely increase.

2. The study detected PFAS in considerably more samples than previous estimates up to 2.38% in the UCMR3. What does this mean for the number of people who might be affected by PFAS contaminated water?

This is also related to the detection levels we used. The PFAS method we used in Phase II had detection levels less than 1 ng/L for all analytes; the method reporting limits used in the UCMR ranged from 10-90 ng/L. We had higher frequencies of detection since we could see lower levels in the water samples.

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

3. The study found 4 samples contained PFAS chemicals above the EPA recommended safety level for PFOS and PFOA. How concerning is this?

There were four samples, but these were the primary and duplicate of the source and treated drinking water from a single utility. We examined the UCMR data for the 25 drinking water treatment plants in the study, to see if the high level was persisting (UCMR 3 was collected after we collected the samples for this study). The UCMR only measures treated drinking water, so while the concentrations for

this drinking water treatment plant were below the health advisory levels, we do not know if this is because the source water concentrations decreased, or if treatment changed and removal increased.

4) The study also found PFPeA and PFHpA at the highest concentrations. But typically we don't hear much about these two chemicals -- most of the attention is on what is thought to be the most common types - PFOS and PFOA. Why did the study find PFPeA and PFHpA at the highest concentrations and what does the finding about our ability to protect people from these substances in their drinking water?

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Thanks,

Megan